

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****SEP 21 2006****REMARKS****Rejections Under 35 USC 112**

To overcome the indefiniteness rejections, the terms "Sn" and "PTFE" in claims 12, 26 and 38 are replaced with "tin" and "polytetrafluoroethylene" respectively.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites catalyzing the oxidation of organic molecules using a catalyst comprising a mixture of platinum and cobalt.

This is not disclosed by any of the references, including the Katsoulis reference. First, Katsoulis' fuel cell does not, as claimed, oxidize organic molecules but only hydrogen (col. 6, line 25). The organic alkanol amine that Katsoulas mentions (col. 6, line 15) is not oxidized but is instead used as a non-consumed electrolyte to "provide sufficient ionic conductivity."

Secondly, Katsoulis does not suggest the particular claimed combination of platinum with cobalt. He merely discloses a wide indeterminate variety of materials by stating (col. 3, lines 1-12), "The electrocatalyst can be of any of the various materials, including pure elements, alloys, mixtures and oxides which will enhance an electrochemical reaction" with a "preferred electrocatalyst" selected from "nickel, cobalt, iron, rhodium ruthenium, palladium, osmium, iridium, platinum, gold, copper, silver and mixtures and alloys thereof." Katsoulis provides no guidance to arrive at the claimed combination of platinum and cobalt.

The only reference that does disclose oxidizing organic molecules is Richter, and his catalyst does not include the claimed cobalt. The cobalt that is initially present in Richter's "starting material" is an "inactive component" that is "dissolved out" when the catalyst is made (col. 2, lines 1, 16-19 and 23-24), leaving only platinum when the catalyst is used for oxidizing glucose.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent Claims 4, 29 and 31

Independent Claims 4, 29 and 31 are patentable over the cited references for the reasons presented above for claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2, 7-28, 30 and 33-52

The remaining claims are dependent claims. They depend from base claims that are explained above to be patentable over the prior art. The limitations that the dependent claims add to the base claims distinguish the dependent claims further from the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims also are patentable.

The application should now be in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Rose

Mitchell Rose, Patent Agent
Registration No. 47,906
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216)586-7094

Date: 9/21/06